

1 ANDREW C. GLASS, *pro hac vice forthcoming*  
andrew.glass@klgates.com  
2 GREGORY N. BLASE, *pro hac vice forthcoming*  
gregory.blase@klgates.com  
3 K&L GATES LLP  
State Street Financial Center  
4 One Lincoln Street  
Boston, MA 02111  
5 Telephone: (617) 261-3100

6 JEREMY M. McLAUGHLIN (SBN 258644)  
jeremy.mclaughlin@klgates.com  
7 JONATHAN THEONUGRAHA (SBN 306812)  
jonathan.theonugraha@klgates.com  
8 K&L GATES LLP  
Four Embarcadero Center, Suite 1200  
9 San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone: (415) 882-8200  
10 Facsimile: (415) 882-8220

11 Attorneys for Defendant  
MDG USA INC.  
12

13 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
14 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
15

16 TYISHA DANZY, individually and on behalf of  
all others similarly situated,  
17

Case No.

Plaintiffs,

**NOTICE OF REMOVAL BY  
DEFENDANT MDG USA INC.**

18 vs.  
19 MDG USA Inc., a Delaware corporation; and  
20 DOES 1-50, inclusive,

(Alameda County Superior Court  
Case No. 22CV007409)

21 Defendants.

22 Complaint Filed: February 23, 2022  
Trial Date: TBD  
23

24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 **TO THE CLERK OF THE COURT:**

2 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT**, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1332, 1441, and 1446,  
3 defendant MDG USA Inc. (“MDG”) removes to this Court the state court action described below.

4 **I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

5 1. On February 23, 2022, plaintiff Tyisha Danzy commenced an action in the Superior  
6 Court of the State of California in and for the County of Alameda, entitled *Tyisha Danzy, individually*  
7 *and on behalf of all others similarly situated, v. MDG USA Inc., a Delaware corporation; and Does 1-*  
8 *50, inclusive*, as Case No. 22CV007409 (“State Court Action”).

9 2. Plaintiff served MDG with a copy of the summons and complaint on February 25, 2022.  
10 A true and correct copy of the summons and complaint is attached as **Exhibit A**. The summons and  
11 complaint attached as **Exhibit A** constitute all the process, pleadings, and orders served upon MDG in  
12 the State Court Action. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1446(a).

13 3. Plaintiff asserts that (a) MDG partners with Capital Community Bank (“CC Bank”), a  
14 bank chartered under the laws of the State of Utah, to issue lines of credit to MDG customers, *see*  
15 Compl. ¶ 14; (b) when consumers purchase merchandise from MDG, with lines of credit obtained from  
16 CC Bank through MDG, the annual interest rate is set at or above 35%, *id.* ¶ 3; and thus, (c) MDG is  
17 attempting to avoid the maximum interest rate allowed under California law, which plaintiff contends  
18 is 10%. *Id.* ¶¶ 13, 17.

19 4. Plaintiff alleges that on or around March 17, 2018, she entered into a revolving credit  
20 agreement (“2018 Agreement”) with CC Bank, pursuant to which she obtained credit to purchase  
21 electronics from MDG at an interest rate of 35.95%. *See* Compl. ¶ 17.

22 5. Plaintiff purports to bring this action on behalf of herself and “[a]ll individuals in  
23 California who, within the four years preceding the filing of this Complaint, paid interest on a loan  
24 obtained from or marketed, underwritten, or serviced by MDG.” Compl. ¶ 22.

25 6. The complaint asserts a single cause of action for purported violation of the California  
26 Unfair Competition Law (“UCL”), Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* The complaint seeks  
27 restitution, injunctive relief, interest, attorneys’ fees, and costs for plaintiff and the putative class. *See*  
28 Compl., Prayer for Relief ¶¶ 1-5.

1       **II. BASIS FOR REMOVAL JURISDICTION—CLASS ACTION FAIRNESS ACT**

2       7.       The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the Class Action  
 3 Fairness Act of 2005 (“CAFA”), and removal of the State Court Action to this Court is proper, because  
 4 (a) the action purports to be a “class action,” (b) the putative class consists of at least 100 supposed  
 5 class members, (c) the citizenship of at least one putative class member is different from the citizenship  
 6 of one defendant, and (d) the aggregate amount in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$5,000,000,  
 7 exclusive of costs and interest. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d).

8       **A. Putative Class Action**

9       8.       CAFA defines a “class action” as “any civil action filed under Rule 23 of the Federal  
 10 Rules of Civil Procedure or similar State statute or rule of judicial procedure authorizing an action to  
 11 be brought by 1 or more representative persons as a class action.” 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(1)(B).

12       9.       Plaintiff alleges that the State Court Action is brought on behalf of an alleged “class”  
 13 pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 382, which authorizes class action suits. *See*  
 14 Compl. ¶ 22.

15       10.      Thus, the CAFA “class action” requirement is satisfied.

16       **B. Putative Class Consists of No Less than 100 Members**

17       11.      Removal under CAFA is appropriate where “the number of members of all proposed  
 18 plaintiff classes in the aggregate” is not less than 100. 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(5).

19       12.      Plaintiff purports to bring this action on behalf of “[a]ll individuals in California who,  
 20 within the four years preceding the filing of this Complaint, paid interest on a loan obtained from or  
 21 marketed, underwritten, or serviced by MDG.” Compl. ¶ 22. Plaintiff further alleges that “the Class  
 22 comprises at least 100 individuals.” *Id.* ¶ 23.

23       13.      Thus, the CAFA requirement regarding the number of purported class members is  
 24 satisfied. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(5).

25       **C. Minimal Diversity of Citizenship Exists**

26       14.      Under CAFA, minimal diversity jurisdiction exists if any member of the purported class  
 27 is a citizen of a state different from any defendant. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2)(A).

28       15.      Plaintiff alleges that she resides in Alameda County, California. *See* Compl. ¶ 6.

1       16. MDG was and is a corporation incorporated under the laws of the State of Delaware and  
 2 has its principal place of business in Oakville, Ontario, Canada. Thus, MDG is not a citizen of  
 3 California. 28 U.S.C. § 1332(c)(1).

4       17. Although the complaint names “doe” defendants sued under fictitious names, pursuant  
 5 to 28 U.S.C. § 1441(b), the Court disregards the citizenship of defendants sued under fictitious names  
 6 for purposes of assessing its jurisdiction following removal. *See Newcombe v. Adolf Coors Co.*, 157  
 7 F3d 686, 690-91 (9th Cir. 1998).

8       18. The complaint does not name any other defendants.

9       19. Thus, minimal diversity exists because defendant MDG is not a citizen of California  
 10 and at least one purported class member, namely, plaintiff, is a citizen of California.

11       **D. Amount in Controversy Exceeds CAFA Threshold**

12       20. CAFA requires that the “matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$5,000,000,  
 13 exclusive of interest and costs.” 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2). “[T]he claims of the individual class members  
 14 shall be aggregated” when determining the matter in controversy. *Id.* § 1332(d)(6).

15       21. “[A] defendant’s notice of removal need include only a plausible allegation that the  
 16 amount in controversy exceeds the jurisdiction threshold.” *Dart Cherokee Basin Operating Co. v.*  
 17 *Owens*, 574 U.S. 81, 89 (2014).

18       22. Plaintiff contends that the alleged 35.95% interest rate charged under the 2018  
 19 Agreement exceeds the purported 10% maximum rate allowed under California law.<sup>1</sup> Compl. ¶ 17.

20       23. Plaintiff seeks relief on behalf of herself and all individuals in California who  
 21 purportedly paid interest on a line of credit from CC Bank used to purchase goods from MDG within  
 22 the four years preceding the filing of the complaint. Compl. ¶¶ 22, 32.

23       24. Plaintiff seeks restitution of all interest paid in excess of 10% over the four-year putative  
 24 class period. Compl. ¶¶ 17, 22, 32.

25       25. Plaintiff seeks an injunction to prevent MDG from collecting interest on the subject  
 26 lines of credit at an interest rate that exceeds 10%. Compl. ¶ 19. The future harm that MDG would

---

27       28 <sup>1</sup> Plaintiff is wrong as a matter of law, but for the purposes of establishing removal jurisdiction, the  
 Court assumes the truth of plaintiff’s allegations. *See Helm v. Alderwoods Grp., Inc.*, No. C 08-  
 01184SI, 2008 WL 2002511, at \*4 (N.D. Cal. May 7, 2008)

1 face in complying with such an injunction must be included when calculating the amount in  
 2 controversy. *See Gonzales v. CarMax Auto Superstores, LLC*, 840 F.3d 644, 648-49 (9th Cir. 2016);  
 3 *Fritsch v. Swift Transp. Co.*, 899 F.3d 785, 793 (9th Cir. 2018);

4 26. Plaintiff seeks attorneys' fees, costs, and interest. Compl., Prayer for Relief ¶ 3-5.  
 5 Awards of attorneys' fees and costs may be included in the amount in controversy. *See, e.g.*,  
 6 *Guglielmino v. McKee Foods Corp.*, 506 F.3d 696, 698 (9th Cir. 2007); *Galt G/S v. JSS Scandinavia*,  
 7 142 F.3d 1150, 1156 (9th Cir. 1998) ("[W]here an underlying statute authorizes an award of attorneys'  
 8 fees, either with mandatory or discretionary language, such fees may be included in the amount in  
 9 controversy."). A fee award in a certified class action can often amount to as much as 25% of a class's  
 10 recovery. *See, e.g.*, *Jasso v. Money Mart Exp., Inc.*, 2012 WL 699465, at \*7 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 1, 2012);  
 11 *Fritsch*, 899 F.3d at 793 (fees incurred at the time of removal as well as future attorneys' fees may be included when assessing the amount in controversy).

12 27. Although MDG denies all liability to plaintiff and the putative class, the complaint  
 13 asserts an aggregate amount in controversy in excess of \$5,000,000 because (a) the difference between  
 14 the amount of interest that MDG collected in the four years preceding the filing of the complaint and  
 15 the amount that it would have collected at a 10% interest rate is at least \$3.8 million, and (b) if the  
 16 Court were to issue the requested injunction, the amount of interest that MDG would be prevented  
 17 from collecting in only the first year after the filing of the complaint would be at least \$1.47 million.  
 18 The sum of those two amounts alone is around \$5.27 million, well in excess of the jurisdictional  
 19 threshold. When the Court adds to that amount the potential award for attorneys' fees and costs, there  
 20 is no question that the amount in controversy requirement is satisfied.

21 **III. BASIS FOR REMOVAL JURISDICTION—FEDERAL QUESTION**

22 28. The Court has original jurisdiction of this action because it involves claims that arise  
 23 under federal law. 28 U.S.C. § 1331.

24 29. MDG may remove the action to this Court because plaintiff's state law claims against  
 25 MDG are completely preempted by federal law. *See Caterpillar Inc. v. Williams*, 482 U.S. 386, 392  
 26 (1987).

1       30. Plaintiff's claims are subject to federal jurisdiction because they purport to challenge  
 2 the amount of interest charged by the 2018 Agreement, which expressly identifies CC Bank as the  
 3 entity providing the line of credit. *See Compl.*, Exhibit 2.

4       31. State-law challenges to the amount of interest charged by a state-chartered bank, such  
 5 as CC Bank, arise under federal law and are completely preempted by the Federal Deposit Insurance  
 6 Act. *See 12 U.S.C. § 1831; accord Cross-Country Bank v. Klussman*, 74 F. App'x 796 (9th Cir. 2003).  
 7 Plaintiff cannot avoid that result by directing the complaint to MDG. *See Hawaii ex rel. Louie v. HSBC*  
 8 *Bank Nevada, N.A.*, 761 F.3d 1027, 1036 (9th Cir. 2014).

9       32. Thus, plaintiff's claims against MDG are completely preempted, and the Court has  
 10 federal question jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331.

11 **IV. REMOVAL PROCEDURE**

12       A. **Removal is Timely**

13       33. Removal of the action to this Court is timely pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b) because  
 14 MDG filed the notice of removal within 30 days of plaintiff serving MDG with the summons and  
 15 complaint on February 25, 2022.

16       B. **Venue is Proper**

17       34. Removal to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California is  
 18 proper because the State Court Action is pending in the Superior Court of the State of California for  
 19 the County of Alameda, which is located within the jurisdiction of this District. 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a);  
 20 28 U.S.C. § 84(a); Civil L.R. 3-2(d).

21       C. **Divisional Assignment**

22       35. The State Court Action arises in Alameda County because plaintiff alleges that a  
 23 substantial part of the events or omissions which give rise to her claims occurred in Alameda County.  
 24 *See Compl.* ¶ 9. Thus, the State Court Action is properly assigned either to the Oakland Division or to  
 25 the San Francisco Division. Civil L.R. 3-2(d).

26       D. **Notice to Plaintiff and State Court**

27       36. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d), MDG is filing written notice of this removal with the  
 28 Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Alameda concurrently with the filing of this

1 notice and will serve that notice on Plaintiff. A copy of the notice that MDG is filing in state court is  
2 attached as **Exhibit B**.

3 **V. CONCLUSION**

4 For the reasons set forth above, the action is removable to this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C.  
5 §§ 1331, 1332, 1441, and 1446, and MDG removes this action from the Superior Court of the State of  
6 California for the County of Alameda to the United States District Court for the Northern District of  
7 California. Thus, MDG respectfully requests that the Court proceed with the action as if it had been  
8 filed originally herein.

9 **K&L GATES LLP**

10  
11 Dated: March 25, 2022

By: /s/ Jonathan Theonugraha

12 ANDREW C. GLASS

13 GREGORY N. BLASE

14 JEREMY M. McLAUGHLIN

JONATHAN THEONUGRAHA

15 Attorneys for Defendant  
16 MDG USA INC.